

**JAMUL DULZURA  
COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP  
DRAFT MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING  
CONTINUED FROM October 26, 2010  
Monday, November 1, 2010  
(To be approved November 9, 2010)  
Oak Grove Middle School Library  
7:30 pm**

1. **Call to Order:** Dan Kjonegaard called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.
2. **Roll Call Present:** Dan Neirinckx, Wythe Davis, Steve Wragg, James Talbot, Michael Casinelli, Janet Mulder, Randy White, Yvonne Purdy-Luxton, Judy Bohlen, Frank Hewitt, Krishna Toolsie, Jonathan Shultz and Dan Kjonegaard.

• **Absent:** Dale Fuller, and Earl Katzer.

**Excused:** Seat 14 Vacant – Wythe Davis resigned 10-26-10

3. **Motion to approve the Agenda for November 1, 2010 as posted 72 hours before the meeting**
5. **Proposed SDG&E Substation Location in Jamul (continued from 10-26-10)**

**Jim Talbot** read a statement, which follows:

**SDG&E Power Sub-Station  
November 1, 2010  
Prepared by James Talbot**

SDG&E has requested a site approval from JDPG for a power sub-station located in Jamul in order for them continue to conduct and complete a full project evaluation for submittal to and approval by the CPUC. JDPG has requested a complete project review before a final recommendation can be made. The project review was to include but not limited to the need for a substation, substation site location and facility construction, transmission line route and construction and distribution line additions and construction.

JDPG sub-committee has reviewed with SDG&E the need for a substation. JDPG sub -committee disagrees with SDG&E on the need for a substation in Jamul. This disagreement is based on current usage, reliability, performance and future growth projections presented by SDG&E. SDG&E has identified engineering standards/codes they must adhere to and comply with as the final determining factor in the decision to construct a sub station in Jamul. As a result we agreed to disagree on the need, reported this to the JDPG and continued with site selection.

JDPG and SDG&E have reviewed more than 30 sites and all except four (4) have been identified by SDG&E as unacceptable.

Site # 2 which is located on Highway 94 and Vista Sage Lane was the most preferred site by JDPG

due to the least impact on the community. SDG&E specified this site as unacceptable due to ingress and egress onto highway 94, impediment of a creek requiring the reconstruction/reengineering of a bridge and potential creek overflow on the property. It is important to mention that residents of the Vista Sage area have complained to CALTRANS and requested road improvements to eliminate the hazardous conditions (multiple accidents have occurred) on Highway 94. Specifically, widening the road to three (3) lanes and adding an entrance/exits lane for Vista Sage. So far the only improvement has been the addition of flashing warning lights. If SDG&E would join together with CALTRANS and make these improvements and mitigate the bridge and overflow issues to utilize site #2 it would be a great service to the Jamul Community.

During the review process SDG&E stated that transmission lines and distribution lines issues could not be reviewed until a site selection was identified. Originally, the transmission line was to follow the central route along Highway 94 to site #9 located at Proctor Valley Road and Maxfield Rd (currently owned by SDG&E). During the discussion process the southern transmission line route was brought up and identified to have the least difficulty for SDG&E to construct and gain approval. A major concern was raised in the sub-committee meetings that the transmission lines could possibly follow the southern route through Echo Valley and along Proctor Valley Road to Maxwell Rd to service site #9 or to Melody Rd to service site #10A, located on Melody Rd and Highway 94. This was concluded to be a major impact on the vast majority of Jamul residents located South and East of Highway 94 and impacted site selection.

An on site review of the remaining four (4) sites was conducted by each member of the sub-committee and site 13 was recommended with site 16 a close second. Site 10A was third and site 9 was forth. During the JDPG meeting on October 26<sup>th</sup> (being continued on November 1<sup>st</sup>) many valid questions and concerns were brought forth by Jamul residents. One question regarding noise of the power sub station and transmission lines was highlighted. Noise has been discussed and SDG&E assured us that noise would meet the requirements per code. However, due to the major concern we felt an on site inspection and review of noise was required.

On Thursday October 28, 2010 Joe Zulauf of SDG&E accompanied Jim Talbot and Dan Neirinckx representing JDPG to the Barrett sub-station, located in Deerhorn Valley area on Manzanita Way, to review the noise impact. This sub station is located in an area without background noise, does not have any walls (only chain linked fence) and contains an older transformer, which is louder than the proposed sub station will contain. The observations are as follows.

1. A constant low tone vibration sound was heard and as we walked away to approximately 125 feet the sound got less but was still audible.
2. Storage shed approx 6' wide by 8' tall and 12' long located inside the chain link fence between the transformer and the chain link fence was approached. If you stood at the middle of the shed (outside the chain fence) zero noise could be heard. As you continued to walk to end of the shed noise was again audible.
3. We walked approximately 500' to the transmission line and stood behind some bushes and a rock. No transmission line clicking sound could be heard or any noise from the power sub station.
4. We also walked in all directions and went behind brush or a rock and the noise was muffled (couldn't be heard).

#### **Conclusion:**

The sub station does have a constant low tone noise. If a structure, rock or bushes are between you and the sub station noise is not apparent.

Any site approval should be given with conditional approval and stipulated:

1. The transmission line route and structure (above ground or overhead) is a controlling item.

2. The power substation must have walls high enough to deflect noise upward and contain some type of noise absorption inside the walls.
3. If the Southern transmission line route is utilized then sites 13 or 16 should be recommended.
4. If the Central transmission line route is selected (highway 94) then undergrounding the line should be stipulated from at least the intersection of Lyons Valley road and Highway 94 to the Substation and sites 9 or 10A should be recommended.
5. A complete project review including transmission line route/ construction, distribution line changes (additions/improvements) and sub station construction needs to be reviewed and recommendations made by the JDPG prior to submittal to CPU for approval.

**Dan Kjonggaard** asked for comments from the JDCPG first:

**Judy Bohlen** suggested that we needed to remember the 3 possible routes – Jamul Drive, (narrow and possibly impossible); Highway 94 (designated as problems with environmental concerns); and up Millar Ranch Road, down through Echo Valley to Proctor Valley Road. All of which have definite negative impacts associated with them. She asked if any substation built with less than 120MVA capacity. Answer - none less than that were approved.

**Steve Wragg** asked what was meant by the Jim in point number 5. Jim stated that we need a full project review before it is taken to CPUC, and that the location of the substation would be conditioned by the location of the transmission line routes.

**Michael Casinelli** – H wants to encourage SDG&E to provide for the community the same concern as other utilities to make them fit into our community character better. He would suggest looking at a smaller footprint and disguising it with landscaping or building type as other utilities have done in our planning area.

**Steve Wragg** asked if there were any substations that were constructed to look like houses.

**Ellis Jones of SDG&E** stated that the type SDG&E constructs is an air-insulated substation. The ones that look like buildings are gas insulated substations that cost two to three times more expensive.

**Krishna Toolsie** asked if this was to serve the community “down the road” then it would seem to be sensible to spend more to have a better look.

**Dan Neirinckx** stated that he feels the transmission routes determine the sites, and until we know where they will be going, it will be difficult to determine the best sites.

**Yvonne Purdy-Luxton** - agreed with Dan, but feels that SDG&E needs to relook at the old Haven property (site #2), as it would be the least impactful to our community.

**Frank Hewitt** – feels that the transmission line will dictate the site location, therefore the Planning Group needs to first recommend a location route for the transmission line and then the selection of the site becomes easier.

**Dan Kjonggaard** stated that there is an existing line running up SR 94 and that they have an existing easement so he feels that there should not be a problem using it.

**Joe Zulauf** stated that there are easements covering the transmission lines servicing to Jamul, but that they would be too small in many cases. The SR 94 route seemed to be the preferred route but SDG&E ran into some challenges that

are very technical. The highway itself is a scenic highway that may preclude an overhead power line. SDG&E will be looking very closely at a SR94 corridor to see if it requires a combination of overhead and underground lines over the next few months. The Echo Valley route (Southern route) is problematic because it is in the view and proximity of those living in Echo Valley. It would have impact to the large tracts of land that are part of the expired SPA known as Hidden Valley. They are looking at minimizing the impacts of a SR 94 route. It will take months before the process can be completed.

**Dan Kjonggaard** reminded us that we have recommended that SR 94 should be four-lanes up to Maxfield, but that the state does not have the money to finance it.

**Jonathan Schulz** asked regarding the cost of putting the lines underground. **Ellis Jones** said it depends on where it is located. If it goes up SR 94, typically an underground line located on a franchise road would run two to three times more than an overhead line.

**Frank Hewitt** stated that realizing that SR94 will be expanded to four lanes and so the question is what does that do to the transmission lines there? When we were working on Las Montanas, they ran into streambed and cliff problems if the road was expanded. **Joe Zulauf** said that if the highway is widened, then SDG&E must relocate their lines at their expense, and therefore he feel they want to use least expensive method if they are going to need to relocate.

**Dan Neirinckx** stated that he wanted to remind the residents of Echo Valley that the developer who owns the property in Echo Valley was here at the last meeting and has stated that he will be developing the property unless they sell it to the agriculture preserve, so the probabilities are that it will not remain “pristine” as they have described it tonight.

**Don Parent** of SDG&E explained that they have public input on all of their projects, as they try to give all citizens a chance to have a voice. He stated that he appreciated the sub-committee’s efforts and feels that SDG&E has given lots of time and effort to the location of this project. Everyone will not be happy no matter where it is sited. He pledged that wherever it is located, they would work with the community to make sure that the individual properties would like what they do. They will lean on the recommendations of the Planning Group as SDG&E plan to move forward on the project. He gave his phone number to the audience and encouraged them to call him with any questions and comments.

**Joe Zulauf** reminded us that it has been a long process and that we are not at the end of the process yet. He stated that the Planning Group is strong and after a site is chosen, then they can start looking at the facility. He would bring in a landscape architect and incorporates the community’s desires and SDG&E’s needs. The location of the transmission line comes into the community will have a large bearing on where the site is located.

**Jim Talbot** pointed out that we have discussed capacity and reliability and that the Planning Group felt that one of the reasons you were going to put in the substation was because of the possible casino, but you said that you were not building it for that reason. Is it the position of SDG&E that they would need to build the substation with or without the casino?

**Ellis Jones** stated that if they did not build the substation and we needed more

power in Jamul, then they would have to underground up SR94, which would cost in excess of 4 million dollars.

**Dash Meeks** stated that there has been no application to the CPUC as it will need to include the preferred site and route and alternatives the CPUC will look at to determine the best. The CPUC typically goes with the least environmentally impacting route. The process is called General Order 131D and we can look it up on the website. If a site has a less than significant impact, then it would only take 90 days. With this long of a transmission line, and a substation, it typically takes 12-18 months to go through the process.

**Dan opened** the public comments and the public asked to see the SDG&E presentation one more time. **Joe Zulauf** showed the possible locations, the four that are under consideration currently, the three routes being considered, (Northern, Southern and Central), graphics showing the possible location of the building on each site, photo sims showing the poles, but not the transmission poles on site 9. One of the photos took an overhead look at site 9 showing the surrounding property. Photo sims were shown on the other three sites to show what the building would look like, but without effective landscaping, however SDG&E said that they would landscape effectively. They would be looking at keeping a low profile.

**Larry Eliason** asked on sites 13 and 16, he wanted to know the owners and SDG&E told them 13 is owned by Otay Ranch and 16 by Hidden Valley.

**Diane Eliason**, Echo Valley resident stated that she is concerned about locating a site near houses and asked SDG&E to find a site that was in open space.

**Sal Ledesma** asked typical height of walls. **Ellis Jones** said that they are typically 10 feet and equipment is 4-6 feet above that. **Don Parent** stated that they are highly regulated and must show cost effectiveness and can take it to the CPUC where they can adjust it. **Sal** pointed out that a view is priceless, so there needs to be a better balance between investment and site.

**Marsha Brown** said that she feels that it needs to be located in a commercial zone, and asked why SDG&E uses a standard footprint. She asks why they could not make it smaller since all of the land would not be used for the substation. **Ellis Jones** stated that communities have grown above expected growth and it has been SDG&E's policy to use the standard of 120 and it is the most cost effective way to handle it. **Marsha** asked if there was an area (like off the dirt road on Proctor Valley) that could be used. **Joe Zulauf** stated there are no road widening improvements planned for site 9, contrary to what citizens have stated. Site 13 is on the extreme edge of the circle area that would be able to be used. It also has major water issues on the other side, west of site 13, so they could not go farther.

**Dan Kjonagaard** suggested that SDG&E could buy the site to hold the ultimate footprint and then build smaller and be able to enlarge or extend the size.

**Joshua Allen** lives behind site 9, and has spent a lot of money improving his property and it will be devalued because of the substation. He is concerned.

**Emerald Randolph** asked if the Jamacha Substation could be enlarged and not put another substation here. She would like to know why the Haven property can not be used, and pointed out that the last two major fires stopped at that spot of site 13. And finally, why do we need a new station in Jamul? The objections of

the people on Echo Valley Road are the same as those of site 9 and her concern is that we listened to the residents of 9 and not to Echo Valley. **Ellis Jones** stated that the Jamacha Substation is currently at 90 megawatts capacity and was built 59 years ago and cannot be enlarged. If Jamacha was expanded to 120 megawatts it could not serve the capacity needed by both Jamul and Jamacha and the surrounding area. In 30 years, it would necessitate building another substation. The shorter the circuit the more reliable the electricity. **Joe Zulauf** stated that the Haven site is unfeasible due to the ingress and egress problems as it would be unsafe. There is a major watercourse going through the property and would need to be dealt with. It would be difficult to get distribution circuits out. The wildfire concerns may be partially alleviated by using steel poles and new design criteria that addresses problems leading to fires.

**Jose Silva** asked how far they will be surveying SR94 and **Joe Zulauf** stated that it would go all the way to Proctor Valley Road. They have met with Caltrans and if they use steel poles, they need to be 20 feet from the fog line. A SR 94 route would service site 9 and possibly site 10A. **Jose Silva** asked about the vacant land off of Olive Vista behind the Barratt House, and was told that they did look at it.

**Andy Salmons** asked why does the substation have to be right next to someone's property? Could it not be sited to better make the community happy and not impact the property owners as much? **Joe Zulauf** said that their search has been exhaustive and it is important to remember that the County, Federal and State owned land is not always available to use for a substation.

**David Romero** asked SDG&E to review this project farther as it will devalue the property around it dramatically. The Haven property would be a natural and we need to let them know how strongly we feel. Jamul is not going to grow that much and the need has not been shown unless they are building for the casino. We need to send letters to people who will make a difference and he would ask the JDCPG to follow through and back up the residents.

**Craig Broderick** asked why the area around Steele Canyon High School could not be used? **Joe Zulauf** said that it is too far away. **Craig** asked how much time was spent studying the mitigation for site 2 (The Haven). Did you consider a stoplight as mitigation? He asked how much it would cost to put the substation on site 9? **Ellis Jones** stated that the cost is determined by the location of the transmission lines and the site. They would come in the central route (up SR94) to site 9 and it would cost about 35 million dollars. If they brought up another line, which would have to be underground from Jamacha substation, it would cost in excess of \$4 million dollars. There is more than just cost involved as it is the responsibility of SDG&E is to make sure we do not have electrical outages in our area.

**Robin Gilmore** wrote a letter regarding this substation five years ago and nothing has changed. We still want it away from our homes, and would ask that you relook at the Haven area to locate the substation.

**John Gutierrez**, long time resident, says that he feels that it is a "done deal" and would ask that all of the lines be put underground.

**Bob Kasmedo** stated that location cannot be determined until transmission lines routes are decided. Taking it down to four sites seems premature before the route

is established, and that more work needs to be done, including a business case assessment and analysis of the sites. **Joe Zulauf** stated that they do not look at a business case, but they do look at cost and environmental impacts. **Bob** asked if they could get a copy of the PowerPoint presented tonight and **Joe** said no, so he was asked about photographs of the locations and overhead views which would give the citizens a look at possible scenarios. **Joe** said he would get pictures of the routing of the transmission lines and he will send them to Janet and she will email them.

**Laura Griffin** asked why 10 a was considered as a site if they do not want to site the substation where there is a water course nor where a large part of land would be impacted as both are true with this property. **Joe Zulauf** stated that to be on the edge of the property near the street is different than going in the center of a large piece of land. Lakes Gaming has represented that the property is for sale, and will discuss with SDG&E later if it is a site seriously being considered. The watercourse is not as challenging on site 10.

**Dave Braithwaite** stated that if site 13 goes in he would be a neighbor, and he feels that somehow they need to work with the Federal or State Government to use some of the land they own in the area to use for this project. **Joe** stated that the land that is owned by the government is for land preservation and much of that land is outside of the development bubble.

**Nick Imbuzan** feels that it is a bad idea to put it close to the residents and SDG&E needs to find a better site away from residents.

**Kristine Castetter** loves the rural area, and feels that it will ruin the country atmosphere. It is an emotional thing and ruins our view shed.

**Laura Murphy** asked if it has been considered to go through Otay Lakes Road from the west. **Ellis Jones** said that it would lead to the Proctor Valley Substation and it would not be practical because it does not have the capacity. The other substation is East Lake and it is being increased in size to capacity at this point, so no way to pick up any extra. They are looking at a Telegraph Canyon substation to be built. **Laura** asked why we could not wait and be a part of that Telegraph substation and was told that was not feasible as it is in the future too far.

**Kathy Dibelka** pointed out that in Echo Valley, homes should be superior to transmission lines. It would cause a difficult visual impact to have transmission lines. She did not see the minutes or the discussion of other possible sites. (The minutes, with the discussion, were sent to all citizens who gave their email address to the secretary.) Millar Ranch Road has trunk lines and could be used at the beginning of Hidden Valley's property. She pointed out that State and Federal lands could be mitigated by land swaps.

**Joe Zulauf** said that the olive orchard had some problems with grounding due to the proximity to the telephone station. They looked at the olive grove and talked to the owner.

**Ben Alva** lives in Echo Valley, but feels that new homes there maybe a while away, and would far prefer to have homes rather than transmission lines as neighbors. The homeowners' investments are heavy and the county standards for noise would make Echo Valley uninhabitable. They looked on the Internet and discovered that the existence of transmission lines really makes a home unsalable.

**Ray Deitchman** lives across from site 9 and a member of the subcommittee for five years. He pointed out that offers of dedication were one of the considerations from SDG&E. What is the setback required for the monopole if it was a transmission pole coming up SR94? **Ellis Jones** will get back to us on the requirements.

**Bill Lukasky** – Echo Valley resident who lives right on top of the substation and questioned how many of the sub-committee live in Echo Valley? He pointed out that because SDG&E does not want to put their substation in the middle of the property it then impacts the neighboring property owner's property more severely.

**Don Huston** Echo Valley resident for 20 years, suggests buying a big piece of property and put the substation in the center and lessens the impact to the residents.

**Debby Escobo** – Echo Valley resident who just finished their new home. She asked who they could contact to protest this. What is the time frame before SDG&E would break ground? **Joe** stated that they would like to begin the permitting process at the beginning of next year. They would break ground in late 2012 or 2013 and would plan for it to be in service by 2014. The health concerns dealing with the electromagnetic fields should be referred to their expert, **Marilyn Dulich, 858-650-4012.**

**Wendy Alva** lives on the hill of Echo Valley and the substation and transmission lines will devalue her property. She asked about the Haven site and **Joe** stated that the site had been looked at.

**Janet Mulder** asked that they bring back another look at The Haven property, taking into consideration all of the changes that have occurred to that property since they first looked at it and also look at mitigating the ingress and egress problems with either a third lane or a signal light on SR94. They could also perhaps use the land directly behind the existing land. **Frank Hewitt** suggested they look at the former Las Montanas 1000 acres to see if they can carve out a location for the substation utilizing part of that property. **Don Parent** will look into the possibility of getting the Las Montanas maps. **Dan Kjongegaard** told them that he would give Don the maps on Las Montanas for them to look at.

**Dan Kjongegaard** pointed out that the community would have an opportunity to comment when it is coming before the CPUC but they will have to watch for the information and then react to it. He would encourage community members to call Dianne Jacob's office to let her know their concerns and then to watch for the minutes and we will let everyone know when the information will be coming before the JDCPG. **Joe Zulauf said that they would plan to be at the December 14 meeting, so SDG&E will not be discussed at the next meeting.**

**Adjournment: Dan Kjongegaard** adjourned the meeting 10:23 PM, reminding us that the next regular meeting is **NOVEMBER 9, 2010 at 7:30 p.m. at OAK GROVE MIDDLE SCHOOL LIBRARY**

Janet Mulder  
Secretary



